

Wright State University

CORE Scholar

Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas

Faculty Senate

12-9-1974

Academic Council Meeting Agenda and Minutes, December 9, 1974

Barbara Dreher

Wright State University - Main Campus

Follow this and additional works at: https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Dreher, B. (1974). Academic Council Meeting Agenda and Minutes, December 9, 1974. .
https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes/33

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact library-corescholar@wright.edu.

Wright State University

Campus Communication

Date: November 21, 1974

To: Members of the Academic Council

From: Barbara Drcher, Secretary, Steering Committee

Subject: Agenda, Academic Council Meeting, Monday, December 2, 1974

COUNCIL WILL MEET AT 3:10 P.M., IN ROOM 155 OF UNIVERSITY CENTER

- I. Call to order.
- II. Approval of Minutes of November 4, 1974, meeting.
- III. Report of the President.
- IV. Report of the Steering Committee (see Attachment A to this Agenda).
- V. Reports of the Standing Committees:
 - A. Curriculum
 - B. Faculty Affairs
 - C. Library
 - D. Student Affairs
- VI. Old Business:
 - A. Approval of Revised Promotion and Tenure Document for Main Campus (continued; discussion by Article). (Attachment F to June 3rd Minutes; Proposed Amendments Attachment D to October 7th Agenda)
 - B. Approval of additional amendments to the Revised Promotion and Tenure Document (see Attachments A and B to November 4th Agenda).
 - C. Approval of a further amendment to the Revised Promotion and Tenure Document (see Attachment B to this Agenda).
- VII. New Business:
 - A. Approval of proposed amendment to the Faculty Constitution (see Attachment C to this Agenda).
- VIII. Adjournment.

BD/el
Attachments

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

December 9, 1974

Minutes

- I. The December meeting, postponed from December 2, was called to order by Chairman Pro Tem Vice President Murray at 3:15 P.M., in Room 155 of the University Center.
- II. Minutes of the November 4, 1974, meeting were approved by voice vote without correction.
- III. Report of the President, Mr. Kegerreis reporting.

Mr. Kegerreis' brief report covered three categories:

What effect the general economic situation may have on enrollment and on legislative support of higher education is a matter of conjecture at this time. It may well be that temporary unemployment of some students will result in their carrying heavier loads due to availability of time; on the other hand, those students who are employed full-time and are laid off may not be able to continue with their education. Any change in state tax structure will be reflected in budgets for all state institutions, although Mr. Kegerreis expressed hope that the legislature might yet adopt higher support for the university systems.

The current campus budgetary problems remain, with no new developments to report since the Fall Faculty Meeting. There have been no hopeful signs to indicate that the over-earned subsidy will be paid to Wright State and, should this trend continue, it will be necessary to undertake a revision of the budget after the Fall Quarter....the University cannot operate at a deficit.

Preparation for the North Central accreditation review continues, with progress being made related to academic programs, including the proposal for a Master of Arts degree in Applied Behavioral Science. The latter proposal is now before the Trustees; with their acceptance, the program will move toward state approval. Approval of the preliminary architectural plans for the main medical building is another landmark for the University's newest school.

Mr. Kegerreis concluding remarks reflected the pride and pleasure of many related to the movement of the campus into diverse activities, the utilization of facilities on week-ends as well as during the week, and overall maturation and expansion of the University.

- IV. Report of the Steering Committee, Mr. Treacy reporting.

The Steering Committee has rescheduled its December meeting; it will meet on December 12 instead of December 11. Anyone having items to submit for consideration will have ample time to have the material in the hands of a member of that committee before Thursday.

Mr. Treacy tested the feeling of the members on holding the January meeting of Council at the Kettering Center. After brief deliberation, it was decided to hold the January meeting in the University Center, in the downstairs rooms 041-043-045, since the dining area is not available. Meetings for the remaining months of the academic year are scheduled in the dining room, No. 155, unless Council should decide later to move elsewhere. Parking, driving conditions, and class time usurped were involved in the decision making.

An item the Steering Committee plans to consider at its next meeting is the Artist and Lecture Series Committee composition; input in this regard would be welcome.

Mr. Treacy briefly brought to the attention of Council a proposed amendment to the Faculty Constitution, to be examined under New Business.

V. Reports of the Standing Committees:

A. Curriculum Committee, Mr. Clark reporting.

Distributed to the Council was a list of the courses brought before the Committee (Attachment A), and Mr. Clark mentioned the challenge of two courses - Management 414 and Sociology 489 - and the withdrawal of one for further modification - Speech 104. Mr. Clark reminded all that thirty days are allowed for the working out of a challenge. If a resolution cannot be reached by involved departments, Curriculum Committee then acts as a hearing board, making its recommendations to the Academic Council.

Mr. Clark mentioned two working projects of the Committee, the first being the modification of the present Course Change form. More information is needed on which the Committee can base its action. The second charge is the consideration of a merging of the two curriculum committees, graduate and undergraduate, the combined committee reporting to the Graduate Council and to Academic Council.

Mr. MacKinney recommended this project be given consideration by the Graduate Curriculum Committee as well.

In response to a query concerning Speech 321 "Speech Pathology I" and Speech 322 "Speech Pathology II", Mr. Clark gave assurance that this involved merely course number changes, not additional courses or change of material taught.

Referring to course challenge, Mr. Levine asked if the Committee sent back to the originating department any course that appeared to be in conflict with an existing course.

Mr. Clark pointed out that if another department did not challenge a course, it automatically went into the inventory, that the Committee received course title and sometimes a syllabus, but not always enough information with which to come to a decision on acceptance.

Mr. Levine asked if each college were not represented on the Committee, that if a conflict was apparent, was not the form sent back to its originator instead of being brought to Council.

Mr. Clark stressed the limit of communication before a course becomes an actuality.

A point of agreement was that any Course Change form not completely filled out should be returned to the department which sent it in, and Mr. Clark assured continued review of these problems by the Committee.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee, Mr. Skinner reporting.

Mr. Skinner mentioned the difficulty the Committee is having in finding appropriate and acceptable wording for Article IV of the Promotion and Tenure Document, referred to them for that purpose at last Council meeting. The members will continue to work with that Article since consideration today is not of that item but of Article VI.

Referring further to Article VI, paragraph C, Mr. Skinner withdrew the Faculty Affairs Committee's proposed amendment (dated August 18, 1974) in favor of the amendment offered by the Steering Committee (dated October 28, 1974). This latter amendment includes representation of the School of Nursing, School of Medicine, and the Western Ohio Branch Campus on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. Mr. Skinner posed the question of the Committee as to inclusion of any other academic group - such as Library - a possibility that would need further consideration.

Mr. Spiegel also has brought to the Committee for evaluation the thought of fixed-term contracts, where a faculty member would be hired for a specific length of time, perhaps one, two, or three years. Contemplation of changes necessary in present procedures to make use of this possibility and yet insure equitable treatment of such faculty will be a part of the workload of the Committee in the coming months.

C. Library Committee, Mr. Zamonski reporting.

A need for further communication of Library policies and procedures is recognized and toward this end, an orientation of Library people was recently held. Revision of the Library organizational chart is underway, for distribution to faculty and staff.

Researching of graduate program funding is continuing, ~~data being gathered from other state universities for the purpose of comparison.~~ *delete 1-13-75*

Interchange of information on periodical security, with estimates of damage, replacement costs, and preventative measures is also being established between universities.

Results of a student questionnaire, data coordinated by Paul Fillo, has been received, pointing to the fact that the Library does not have complete "sets" of periodicals and journals. Student feeling was also expressed that holdings are not sufficient for classroom support. Mr. Zamonski pointed out that to meet this expressed need would require more funding. The recommendation has been received that Library should use a booklet to make known to students its policies and procedures, with descriptions of the responsibilities of Library personnel. A further improvement suggestion resulting from the questionnaire was the development of a special course on use of the Library, perhaps to be incorporated in Freshman English. Groups have been and are invited for explanatory tours of the various areas.

A letter expressing appreciation has been sent to Mrs. Verniece Osborne, Media Distribution Services, for the excellent classroom support given by her and members of her staff.

Mr. Frommeyer was recognized by the Chair for comments related to the Library.

First, Mr. Frommeyer mentioned, for the record, that the course LCS 110 fills the need for instructions in Library use but perhaps the title needs clarification so that students will recognize the course content more easily.

During the next week, installation will begin on the 3-M security system, with representatives from that company in the University today. Much endeavor has been expended to assure this system working properly, taking into consideration adaptation to the needs of handicapped persons. Mr. Frommeyer explained that material (known as the "target") is incorporated in books and those holdings to be protected; this triggers an alarm at the exit area if not demagnetized by the person at the check-out desk. He further explained, in answer to questions, that the target is not easily detected nor would it be a simple matter for an unauthorized demagnetizer to be developed. Targets cannot be in every holding, but are placed at random in a significant number of books. Explanatory signs will be up in the Library concerning the system. The goal is to have the system completely installed and operable on January 6, 1975. There is to be considerable publicity related to this, with articles in the Guardian and through other news media. Feedback will be welcomed as use of the system continues.

Mr. Zamonski solicited items for consideration by the Library Committee at its next meeting, January 10, 1975.

D. Student Affairs Committee: there was no report to be given.

VI. Old Business:

A., B., C., Approval of Revised Promotion and Tenure Document for Main Campus (continued; discussion by Article). See Composite furnished each member, which synopsis includes present version, proposed amendments, approvals and discussion to date.

Mr. Gray moved that debate be limited to one hour for each item, as at previous meetings.

The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.

Mr. Murray reminded Council that approval had been given Articles I, II, III, V, and VII, as well as paragraph A of Article VI. This placed discussion at paragraph B of Article VI (Article IV referred back to Faculty Affairs Committee for re-wording).

Mr. Skinner initiated discussion by directing attention to the proposed amendment to this paragraph, reading it with the incorporation of a minor change in wording of the first sentence:

"Each College shall have a Promotion and Tenure Committee composed of the Dean, who chairs the committee but does not vote at the College level, and at least three senior faculty members, who are chosen according to procedures developed by the College, to ensure maximum possible

representation of each department. This committee will review the departmental recommendations, and the Dean will transmit the College Committee's recommendations along with his own evaluations of the candidates to the Wright State Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Dean will also inform the candidates of the committee's action."

Mr. Skinner placed a motion for approval of this amendment, it was seconded, and discussion opened.

Mr. Wachtell placed a motion for an amendment to this amendment, replacing the first sentence of the paragraph:

"Each College shall have a Promotion and Tenure Committee, the composition of which shall be determined by the faculty of that College."

Mr. Wachtell stated he felt the number of members and composition of the committee should be decided on an individual college basis.

Motion for the amendment to the amendment was seconded by Mr. Levine; floor review began.

Mr. Cantelupe questioned if the wording of the remainder of the paragraph was to be changed; Mr. Wachtell verified change of the first sentence only, and Mr. Cantelupe pointed out the difficult position the Dean would be placed in, in trying to defend or back up a decision made when he was not present.

It was agreed that Deans do, uniformly, now chair the committees.

Mr. Sachs supported the desirability of having the Dean on the committee, even in a non-voting position, because he does play a role in deliberation, contributing information and background data not necessarily available to others. He wondered if perhaps a committee with more than three members might not be a better idea, reminding Council that the original wording had stated five members, with a minimum of three stated to cover the possibility of a college not having five senior faculty.

Mr. Wade questioned why the larger number would be better, and Mr. Sachs stated he felt a wider variety of opinions to be better.

Mr. Wachtell interjected that his amendment did not preclude the Dean being the chairman nor did it fix a number of committee members - that the college could decide on three, five, or seven, or whatever number they chose. His point of stress was that this degree of autonomy be permitted each academic unit, it being their right to decide the composition.

Mr. Levine saw this amendment to the amendment as an extension of previous action allowing the departmental committee to be formed according to the desires of the department (paragraph A, Article VI).

Mr. Winkler inquired if this meant student representatives could be included in the composition, and it was agreed that nothing in the Constitution would rule this out.

Mr. MacKinney asked for verification of his interpretation: that a Dean might be expected to defend at the University level an action of the committee that he had not had part in making and had not even been present at the origination of the action.

Mr. Wachtell admitted that this could happen, but although the Dean might be left out, he should still know what went on at the meeting.

Mr. MacKinney went on record as being against the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Levine pointed out that the Dean would be advised by way of the committee's report, its deliberations being outlined, and that the Dean could call the committee together and review the report with them.

Mr. Cantelupe mentioned the obvious difference between reading a report and being present, observing the development of that report. Further, by his absence, the Dean might be prevented from presenting certain information available only to him.

Interchange brought out that the proposed amendment to the amendment did not preclude the Dean being chosen to chair the committee, being invited to sit in on the proceedings, but neither did it definitely include him in the proceedings. The possibility remained that a college could omit the Dean from committee composition, and Mr. Wachtell admitted - in response to Mr. Wade's query - that there might be in this a disadvantage to the college. However, he still felt each college should structure its own committee.

Mr. MacKinney referred members to the proposal made by Faculty Affairs, that this stated "...are chosen according to procedures developed by the College, ". In effect, Mr. Wachtell's amendment to the amendment merely made it possible for the Dean to be excluded from the deliberations of the committee.

Mr. Wachtell stated this was not his intent, rather that the faculty of a college be permitted to structure its own committee, that he felt theirs should be the prerogative of perhaps including students... that they should be able to define the status of those to be on the committee. In this relation, he wondered exactly what was meant by "senior" faculty members.

Mr. Iddings went on record in support of Mr. MacKinney's expressed feelings - that indeed the Dean occupied a unique position, that he alone could provide certain kinds of input - to the benefit of the faculty.

Mr. Harvey felt that should a Dean be left out, it would be for cause, that there would be a reason behind it.

Mr. Nussbaum commented that if a college "experimented" with structure to the point of omitting the Dean and/or including a student and this proved to their disadvantage,

that he felt they would not do it the second time.

Mr. Hutchings further supported the stance that the Deans do have a role to play in the committee in its efforts to gain as much information as possible.

Voice voting on the amendment to the amendment was uncertain and a show of hands was requested:

Against 17

In favor 10

The amendment to the amendment failed; discussion resumed on the original amendment.

Mr. Levine questioned exactly what was meant by "senior faculty", and wanted to continue with the thought of a statement without specifications as to who should serve.

Mr. Skinner replied that there were included in his college Associate Professors and Professors, and that it is normally accepted that senior faculty members are usually tenured persons. Basis for this definition would be the fact that these people had been here a number of years, knew more of the background of those being considered for promotion, and had achieved a certain stature for good judgement.

Mr. Sachs wondered if there should be in the document some stated distinction between college and school. The general conception seems to be that schools are smaller than colleges; the schools perhaps might not have enough faculty to provide five members for the promotion and tenure committee and the number three could apply to them.

Mr. Skinner agreed that such wording had not been included in the amendment and that something needed to be included indicative of a level higher than departmental.

Mr. Sachs felt the use of "college or school committee" needed to be included; further the amendment as stated "five senior faculty members, when available, but in any case no less than three." would take into account that schools are relatively small and so might not have the "five" mentioned.

Mr. Skinner spoke for Faculty Affairs that this was their intent in leaving in the minimum limit, and it would be expected that larger units would have more members in their committees.

Mr. Hughes questioned if a definition of "senior faculty members" should be included, and Mr. Skinner offered the substitution of "at least three Professors or Associate Professors" in place of "and five senior faculty members, when available, but in any case no less than three,".

Mr. Levine placed an amendment to the amendment:

h College shall have a Promotion and Tenure Committee composed

of the Dean, who chairs the committee but does not vote at the College level, and the appropriate number of faculty members, who are chosen according to procedures developed by the College, to ensure maximum feasible representation of each department."

Mr. Cantelupe asked if this meant representatives from each department and Mr. Levine explained that would be at the discretion of the college, since the original document and his amendment used the phrase "maximum feasible representation". Mr. Levine's suggestion deleted the status specifications for members and also the stated number to be on the committee.

Mr. Skinner made apparent the difficulty in choosing words for an amendment, by offering that "appropriate" might need definition.

Mr. Sachs suggested that Mr. Levine restate his proposed amendment to the amendment, including "and School" in the appropriate places.

Mr. Levine withdrew his motion, the second was withdrawn, and Mr. Levine restated his motion:

"Each College and School shall have a Promotion and Tenure Committee composed of the Dean, who chairs the committee but does not vote at the College or School level, and the appropriate number of faculty members, who are chosen according to procedures developed by the College or School, to ensure maximum feasible representation of each department. This committee will review the departmental recommendations, and the Dean will transmit the College or School Committee's recommendations along with his own evaluations of the candidates to the Wright State Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Dean will also inform the candidates of the committee's action."

This amendment to the amendment was seconded.

Mr. Zamonski asked if this took into consideration the needs of the Library.

Mr. Skinner stated that might be included in the preparation of the final draft of the document, at this point seemed a bit premature, but was the kind of reference that should be done later.

Mr. Martin, by illustration, showed that a college's interpretation of "appropriate number" might not reflect well on that college if they felt one member to be appropriate, and urged Mr. Levine to retain that part of the original wording which read "in any case no less than three".

Mr. Levine agreed to this, withdrew his motion, and its second was withdrawn. He then restated the motion, making the following insertion -

".....the appropriate number of faculty members, not less than one, and not more than three."

who are chosen according....."

Mr. Martin seconded this motion.

Mr. Zamonski asked for clarification from Mr. Skinner as to where Library would "fall", particularly in reference to this proposed amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Skinner reminded Council that sometimes wording alterations made toward the end of a document, reviewed in the manner such as this review of the Promotion and Tenure Document, made changes in the wording necessary toward the beginning of the document. A decision to include the Library, designated by the grouping with school or college, would be taken care of when the document was re-worked and brought back to Council for formal approval.

Mr. Treacy commended Council on the diligence shown in working with the document but suggested the purpose of the Steering Committee's having the document brought to Council was to obtain voting on issues of substance rather than detail. He urged the Council to vote decisively on main issues and then to rely upon the sagacity of the Faculty Affairs Committee to embody the intent.

Mrs. Dreher saw the amendment to the amendment as two issues: The first, related to the size of the committee, being a matter of logistics and easily handled. She expressed the feeling that the key issue was related to the recognition of "senior" or "tenured" faculty. Mrs. Dreher pointed out that faculty members earned that status through merit and achievement and represented credibility to the outside community. She urged consideration of credibility versus the "now" thing.

Mr. Cantelupe felt that it was at the department level where the broader representation should be, and stated he would regret seeing the omission of the word "senior". He labeled the college level committee "crucial", acting as it does between the lower and highest level of the University, and expressed a preference of the use of the word "tenured" in designation of members of the committee.

Mr. Levine spoke in support of his motion, stating that his offering of it did not relate to "merit" but to his feeling that the need for a broad spectrum of opinion at the departmental level carried on to the college level as well. He stated that he did not feel the acquisition of tenure brought with it an assurance of wisdom or sagacity; further, that the hiring of a person with the expectation of that person fulfilling all faculty responsibilities but not having the ability to consider promotion and tenure appeared to be an insult to that person.

Mr. Cantelupe countered with the opinion that it should not insult one to be advised that experience or service time played a part in his inclusion in this type of decision making. He stated he felt there should be some kind of gradation, that for a committee acting in the manner of arbitrator between departmental and University levels some consideration should be given of a different kind of structure.

Mr. Levine offered a clarifying thought to Mr. Wade, that a report from a committee

Academic Council Minutes

December 9, 1974

Page Ten

is only as good as its members can provide and that the college faculty should be permitted to choose those members they felt were capable, regardless of tenure. His feeling that age, time and years of service do not guarantee wisdom was expressed.

Mr. Sachs spoke against the amendment to the amendment, pointing out that the faculty as a whole had elected the representatives to the Academic Council, with Academic Council assuming the responsibility for decision making. An amendment taking that decision making responsibility from Council and assigning it to faculty of individual colleges would appear contradictory.

Mr. Treacy called for the question.

Two-thirds vote being required to close debate, Mr. Treacy placed a motion for the closing of debate on this item; the motion was seconded by Mrs. Dreher.

Voting for closing debate was affirmative, Mr. Levine being the sole exception.

Mr. Murray asked for hand voting on Mr. Levine's reworded amendment to the amendment:

Against 17

In favor 10

The proposed amendment to the amendment was not approved.

Mr. MacKinney placed a motion for an amendment to the amendment, identical to Mr. Levine's with the addition of the word "tenured":

"....the appropriate number of tenured faculty members, not less than three, who are chosen according...."

This motion was seconded.

Mr. Sachs expressed doubt that the newer schools would have enough tenured faculty to form a committee with the requirement of three tenured faculty.

For clarification, Mr. Murray read the latest amendment to the amendment:

"Each College and School shall have a Promotion and Tenure Committee composed of the Dean, who chairs the committee but does not vote at the College or School level, and the appropriate number of tenured faculty members, not less than three, who are chosen according to procedures developed by the College or School, to ensure maximum feasible representation of each department. (The remaining portion as in Mr. Levine's offering.)

Mr. Neve asked if this was a specification of status of members. His interpretation of

the original use of the word "senior" was that members chosen might be senior faculty who did not necessarily have tenure.

This thought was not contradicted.

Hand voting on the amendment to the amendment:

Against 14
In favor 12

There was a question on the voting and a recount requested showed hand votes of:

Against 15
In favor 12

Mr. MacKinney's amendment to the amendment failed.

Mr. Murray again directed attention to the original amendment offered by Faculty Affairs Committee.

Mr. Neve offered an amendment to the amendment, the part differing as follows:

"....the appropriate number of senior faculty members, not less than three, who are chosen according...."

A second to the motion was heard; discussion brought out that this differed only very slightly from the amendment offered by Faculty Affairs, so Mr. Neve withdrew his motion, the second was withdrawn, and review returned to the original amendment.

Mr. Skinner agreed, in answer to a question, that this meant each college would define "senior". He did mention that later in the document there is a statement that members of College and University Committees must be tenured and this will be debated when that portion is reviewed.

The question was called; voting to close debate was seconded and carried by a definite voice vote.

Mr. Murray read the original amendment, as given by Mr. Skinner at the initiation of Old Business, with the inclusion of the words "and School" where appropriate:

"Each College and School shall have a Promotion and Tenure Committee composed of the Dean, who chairs the committee but does not vote at the College or School level, and at least three senior faculty members, who are chosen according to procedures developed by the College or School, to ensure maximum feasible representation of each department. This committee will review the departmental recommendations, and the Dean
1 transmit the College or School Committee's recommendations along

Academic Council Minutes

December 9, 1974

Page Twelve

with his own evaluations of the candidates to the Wright State Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Dean will also inform the candidates of the committee's action."

The amendment to paragraph B, Article VI, was passed without exception.

VII. New Business:

A. Approval of proposed amendment to the Faculty Constitution (Attachment C to the Agenda).

For the Steering Committee, Mr. Treacy offered the updating amendment to the Faculty Constitution, Article III, Section 8, paragraph A., Officers and General Duties:

"(A) The Chairman of the Academic Council shall be the President of the University and shall preside. The President may delegate this duty, respectively, to the Provost, to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, to the Vice Chairman of the Academic Council, to the Chairman of the Steering Committee, or to another member of the Academic Council."

Mr. Treacy pointed out that Council was in technical violation of the Constitution in having Mr. Murray serve as Chairman, since the position he fills did not even exist when the Constitution was written and approved.

This matter will be considered under Old Business at the next meeting of the Council.

Mr. Levine asked if a problem would develop if the wording of the second sentence were limited to:

"The President may delegate this duty."

This would serve to eliminate the necessity for changing the Constitution, he felt.

Mr. Treacy expressed his opinion that this might open the item to major debate, whereas the minor updating could be voted upon at next meeting and placed on the Agenda for the Winter Quarter Faculty Meeting for voting.

Mr. Nussbaum questioned the inclusion of the position of Associate Provost, thus illustrating the possible development of an endless list of persons to whom the chairmanship might be delegated.

Further discussion was postponed until next meeting.

B. Mr. Treacy distributed copies of Mr. Hlusman's "Report of Faculty Advisory Committee to Chancellor". (See Attachment B.)

VIII. A motion for adjournment was heard, seconded, and passed by voice vote at 4:53 P.M.